



March 24, 2000

Hon. John M. Phillips  
Presiding Judge of the  
Coordinated Trial Courts  
Monterey County  
P.O. Box 414  
Salinas, CA93902

Re: Final Report of the 1999 Monterey County Civil Grand Jury  
Dear Judge Phillips:

Pursuant to Penal Code Section 933(b), the following responses are respectfully submitted:

### **RESPONSE TO FINDINGS**

Finding #1:

"A significant danger from waste by-products, related to both the manufacture and usage of methamphetamine, places the population-at-large in an at-risk situation. Major meth-makers frequently change the locations of their manufacturing operations making their discovery difficult for law enforcement."

**Response:**

**The respondent agrees with the finding.**

Finding #2:

"Monterey County is the unwitting host to large numbers of individuals involved in the clandestine manufacturing of meth. The profit incentive encourages many individuals to engage in the criminal practice of making of meth."

**Response:**

**Based on information from the Monterey County Sheriff's Department via our police department, the respondent agrees with the finding.**

Finding #3:

"The prevalence of meth-related criminal activities places the population-at-large at increased risk of such crimes as burglary, robbery, and assault."

**Response:**

**The respondent agrees with the finding.**

Finding #4:

"Monterey County is experiencing an increasing incidence of meth-usage and addiction among the population-at-large, especially among youths. Meth manufacturers have developed a multi-level (pyramid) sales scheme."

**Response:**

**The respondent agrees with the finding.**

Finding #5:

"The seizure of assets, including real property of individuals involved in meth-making, is often not being exercised by Monterey County law enforcement."

**Response:**

**The respondent cannot speak to this finding as it relates to other jurisdictions. Keeping in mind that the District Attorney's office makes the determination as to whether asset seizure is appropriate and should be pursued, the City of Monterey works to pursue asset seizures when appropriate and within the law.**

## **RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS**

Recommendation #1

"Law enforcement agencies approach the methamphetamine problem as a distinct entity not related to other drug enforcement activities."

**Response:**

**The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable. It is our belief that this course of action is not reasonable for the City of Monterey. Drug dealing and drug using are all interconnected. Dealers sell more than one type of drug and users use more than one type of drug. It may well be that the Monterey County Sheriff's Department, who**

**deals with methamphetamine labs in the typically rural areas, would wish to do this.**

Recommendation #2:

"Law enforcement agencies be required to submit information concerning all arrests relating to methamphetamine to the press in the form of press releases rather than simply indicating such incidents in the daily activities logs."

**Response:**

**The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable. As a blanket policy, this could actually jeopardize ongoing investigations and in extreme cases, could be a danger to the informants and officers as well. It should be noted that the media is under no obligation to publish or otherwise utilize information provided to them.**

Recommendation #3:

"Law enforcement agencies develop a coordinated communications plan so that methamphetamine information can be effectively shared by all agencies."

**Response:**

**The recommendation has been implemented. Once again, respondent cannot speak to other jurisdictions operational issues. Our officers currently have ongoing communications with allied agencies. Furthermore, existing protocols are already in place through Western States Information Network (WSIN) as well as the Narcotic Enforcement Unit County of Monterey (NEUCOM).**

Recommendation #4:

"The Monterey County Board of Supervisors (SOS) seek the means for funding special methamphetamine-abatement personnel and programs."

**Response:**

**While respondent does not disagree with the recommendation, it does not appear to apply to the City of Monterey.**

Recommendation #5:

"The BOS seek the means of funding environmental clean-up of legally seized, methamphetamine-related properties, and execute the resale of such properties as a means of funding increased anti-methamphetamine activities."

**Response:**

Once again, while respondent does not disagree with the recommendation, it, like #4, is a county specific issue.

Recommendation #6:

"The BOS and City Councils provide funding for the purchase of a meth-trained canine."

**Response:**

The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable. The Sheriff's Department and NEUCOM currently have dogs trained to sniff out narcotics. Due to the dangerous chemicals typically found in and around methamphetamine labs, our police department believes it would be ill advised to utilize a narcotic sniffing dog in the vicinity of a suspected lab.

Recommendation #7:

"The BOS and City Councils provide funding for the training and placement of more meth-qualified Deputies in the field."

**Response:**

The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable. Though, as stated above, we recognize the problems surrounding the use and manufacturing of methamphetamine and can appreciate the desire for more "meth-qualified Deputies in the field", we also must consider all public safety/quality, of life issues for our citizens and the limited resources available to most those needs. As such, we would not be in a position to help fund the Monterey County Sheriffs Department.

Sincerely,



Clyde Roberson  
Vice-Mayor

c: City Council  
Police Chief  
City Clerk